5

<u>REMARKS</u>

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application in view of the following amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 16, 18-22, 49 and 50 are in this application. Claims 16, 18-22, 49 and 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claims 16, 18-22, 49 and 50 have been canceled. New claims 57-72 have been added.

In the Examiner's communication of April 12, 2003, the Examiner objected to claim 20 and claim 49 as written at the time and informed Applicant that these two claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In order to expedite the prosecution, Applicant has chosen to submit new independent claim 57 which is substantially identical to the claim 20 objected to by the Examiner in the communication of April 12, 2003. Additionally, Applicant has written new claims 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63 and 64 depending from independent claim 57. Claims 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63 and 64 include the limitations of claims 18, 19, 21, 22, 48, 49 and 50 from April 12, 2003, respectively. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant has chosen to also submit new independent claim 65, which is substantially identical to claim 49 objected to by the Examiner in the communication of April 12, 2003. Additionally, Applicant has written new claims 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71 and 72 depending from independent claim 65. Claims 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71 and 72 include the limitations of claims 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 48, and 50 from April 12, 2003, respectively. No new matter has been introduced.

New independent claims 57 and 65 feature language that the Examiner has deemed allowable. Applicant is of the opinion that independent claims 57 and 56, and consequently claims 58-64 and 66-72 that respectively dependent thereform, are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully Submitted,

Martin D. Magnihan Martin Moynihan

Registration No. 40,338

Date: November 30, 2004